

REMARKS

Claims 7-15 are in the case. Claims 7-12 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 USC § 102 over USPA 2002/0130049 to Chen et al. Claims 7, 9, and 11-15 are rejected under 35 USC § 102 over USPA 2003/0114087 to Duboust et al. Claim 7 has been amended and claims 1-6 and 16-20 are canceled. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments, which are supported by the disclosure of the original specification, such as in paragraph [0036] and figure 1. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §102

Claims 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being unpatentable over one or both of Chen et al. and Duboust et al. In a telephonic interview between the examiner and the applicants' attorney Rick Barnes on 2006.05.02, an agreement was reached that the claims as now amended patentably define over the cited references. It was further agreed that the applicants would file this amendment with an RCE, so that the examiner could further search the limitation.


CONCLUSION

Applicants assert that the claims of the present application patentably define over the prior art made of record and not relied upon for the same reasons as given above. Applicants respectfully submit that a full and complete response to the office action is provided herein, and that the application is now fully in condition for allowance. Action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

In the event this response is not timely filed, applicants hereby petition for the appropriate extension of time. If any fees are required by this amendment, then such fees may be charged to deposit account 12-2252.

Sincerely,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By: 

Rick Barnes, 39,596

2006.05.06